

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. Entry of this amendment under Rule 116 is merited because the claims have not been amended and no new issues have been raised.

Claims 10-18 remain pending in the application. Applicants appreciatively note that claim 16 contains allowable subject matter indicated by the Examiner.

Claim 18 is objected to as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Claim 18 clearly recites that the light radiation observed by each pupil is constantly directed toward a separate part of the sensor by the optical means, which is not identical to the last limitation claimed in claim 10. The limitation “constantly” in claim 18 is not recited in claim 10. This claimed feature in claim 18 finds support at page 5 line 33 to page 6 line 2 of the original specification. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The word “distinct” recited in claim 10 means that parts of the object filed can be distinguished and the parts are not equal. Under this interpretation, one person having ordinary skill in the art would understand the feature recited in claim 11, i.e., the varies parts (the distinct parts) can be partially overlapped. Therefore, the limitations in claims 10 and 11 are not mutually contradictory,

Further, because the “varies parts” in claim 11 refer to a “distinct part” in claim 10, the limitations of claim 11 find sufficient antecedent basis in claim 10.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12, 14 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hall, U.S. Patent No. 5,692,226 (hereafter referred to as 'Hall'). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is a combination of two characteristics, the division of the object field and a catadioptric configuration (at least one mirror) to observe an image. See page 5 lines 8 to 9 of the specification in the present application. By contrast, Hall discloses a stereoscopic device. Hall discloses a device that observes two distinct images to obtain a stereoscopic combination of the two images. In the present application, the image that is observed by parts through the different entry pupils is reconstructed by juxtaposition of the different parts.

Claim 10 recites that the optical means comprise at least one mirror and a plurality of entry pupils, each said entry pupil for observing a distinct part of the object field, and the light radiation to be observed by each said pupil is directed toward a separated part of the sensor by the optical means. This feature is not disclosed by Hall.

According to the claimed subject matter in claim 10, for each distinct part of the object field, the light radiation observed by one pupil reflected by at least a mirror (two mirrors 21, 22 in the disclosed embodiment of the present application) and is directed toward a separated part of the sensor. On the contrary, Hall discloses that, if the rays 14 go to different parts 17 of the captor, the rays 14 are not reflected by mirrors 10 and 11. If the rays 14 are reflected by the mirrors 10 and 11, the rays 14 lead to the same captor 13. Therefore, Hall fails to disclose the claimed feature of claim 10.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 10 should be patentable over the applied art and this rejection should be withdrawn.

The dependent claims depend upon claim 10 and should also be patentable for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 10 as well as for their own merits.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Igel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,370,960 (hereafter referred to as 'Igel'). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because none of the applied art singly or in combination disclose or suggest that "signal processing means are produced in the space on the substrate", as recited in claim 13.

As disclosed in Fig. 2, Igel discloses spaces between parts (electrodes) 8, but nothing is disclosed in the spaces. The Examiner further asserts that one person having ordinary skill in the art would place signal processing means within the spaces, Applicants respectfully disagree, because such proposed combination appears to be based on hindsight reasoning. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hall nor Igel suggests the desirability of combining such teachings to position signal processing means in the Igel spaces. Accordingly, claim 13 should be patentable and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Sugawara, Pub. No. US 2001/0015847 (hereafter referred to as 'Sugawara'). Claim 15 depends upon claim 10 and should be patentable for the reason advanced with respect to claim 10. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: July 9, 2009
KMB/CHY/ser